



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/500,930

10/19/2005

Sami Vaarala

290.1078USN

1571

33369 7590 06/01/2009  
FASTH LAW OFFICES (ROLF FASTH)  
26 PINECREST PLAZA, SUITE 2  
SOUTHERN PINES, NC 28387-4301

EXAMINER

SETO, JEFFREY K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2458

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/01/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/500,930	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VAARALA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jeffrey Seto	<b>Art Unit</b> 2458	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-27 are pending.

***Response to Amendment***

2. In response to the amendment filed 1-17-09:
  - a. The objections to claims 1, 17 & 18 are withdrawn; and,
  - b. The rejection of claim 26 under 35 USC 112, 2d paragraph is withdrawn.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 1-17-09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regards to Applicant's argument that Linnakangas only teaches a secure connection between host 4 and router 2, and does not teach a secure connection between host 5 and router 2. Linnakangas teaches that a virtual private network is established to provide secure communications between host 4 and host 5, via router 2 (See par. 24, 4-8). Thus, a secure connection is provided between host 5 and router 2.
4. Regarding Applicant's argument that Linnakangas delivers "plain text" from the router 2 to the host 5. The Examiner has fully reviewed Linnakangas and found no teaching in the reference supporting this assertion.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2458

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 22-24, 26 & 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0047487 to Linnakangas, et al. (Linnakangas).
2. Regarding claim 1, Linnakangas teaches a method for secure forwarding of a message from a first computer to a second computer via an intermediate computer in a telecommunication network(See paragraph 24, lines 4-8; wherein the local host 5 is the first computer, remote host 4 is the second computer, and router 2 is the intermediate computer), comprising: establishing a secure connection between the first computer and the second computer via the intermediate computer (See par. 24, lines 4-11; wherein message formation is inherent in “communication” and “exchanging user generated traffic”), in the first computer, forming a secure message by giving the secure message a first unique identity and a first destination address to the intermediate computer (See par.'s 4 & 24; wherein the SPI is the unique identity, and the header inherently includes the destination address), sending the secure message from the first computer to the intermediate computer (See par. 24, lines 4-6), the intermediate computer receiving the secure message and performing a translation by using the first unique identity to find a second destination address to the second computer, (See par.'s 4 & 24; wherein a router that is able to perform IPSec and IKE translation, inherently includes a translation

Art Unit: 2458

table), the intermediate computer substituting the first destination address with the second destination address to the second computer (See par.'s 4 & 24; wherein address substitution is a standard part of IPSec processing and IKE translation), the intermediate computer substituting the first unique identity with a second unique identity, (See par.'s 4 & 24; wherein generating and substituting SPI's is a standard part of IPSec processing and IKE translation), and the intermediate computer forwarding the secure message with the second destination address and the second unique identity to the second computer (See par. 24, line 11).

3. Regarding claim 2, Linnakangas discloses forming the secure message in step b) by using an IPSec connection between the first computer and the second computer (See par. 24, lines 4-7).

4. Regarding claim 3, Linnakangas discloses performing a secure forwarding of the message by making use of SSL or TLS protocols (See par. 24, lines 4-7; wherein using a secure socket layer (SSL) is inherent in IPSec).

5. Regarding claim 4, Linnakangas discloses manually performing a preceding distribution of keys to components for forming the IPSec connection (See par. 40, lines 8-12; wherein manual distribution occurs when the IKE module is responding to a request).

6. Regarding claim 5, Linnakangas discloses performing a preceding distribution of keys for forming the IPSec connection by an automated key exchange protocol (See par. 40, lines 8-12; wherein automated key exchange occurs when the IKE module initiates negotiations).

Art Unit: 2458

7. Regarding claim 7, Linnakangas teaches sending the message that is sent from the first computer as a packet that contains message data, an inner IP header containing the actual sender and receiver addresses, an outer IP header containing the addresses of the first computer and the intermediate computer (See par. 3, lines 1-6).

8. Regarding claim 8, Linnakangas teaches the IPSec connection being one or more security associations (SA) and the unique identity being one or more SPI values (See par. 4, lines 5-14).

9. Regarding claim 9, Linnakangas teaches performing the matching in step d) by using a translation table stored at the intermediate computer (See par. 31, lines 1-6; wherein the IP forwarder module is part of the intermediate computer).

10. Regarding claim 10, Linnakangas teaches changing both the address and the SPI-value by the intermediate computer (See par. 24; wherein IPSec includes replacing addresses in accordance with the translation tables, and assigning a new SPI value to every received packet).

11. Regarding claim 22, Linnakangas teaches a telecommunication network for secure forwarding of messages, comprising: a first computer, a second computer and an intermediate computer, the first and the second computers having a secure connection therebetween via the intermediate computer, the first and the second computers having means for performing an IPSec processing, and the intermediate computer having translation tables to perform IPSec and IKE translation (See par. 24, lines 1-15; wherein local host 5 is the first computer, remote host 4 is the second computer, and router 2 is the intermediate computer).

Art Unit: 2458

12. Regarding claim 23, Linnakangas teaches the translation table for IPsec translation has IP addresses of the intermediate computer to be matched with IP addresses of the second computer (See par. 24, lines 4-6; wherein the router inherently has translation tables to perform IPsec).

13. Regarding claim 24, Linnakangas teaches the translation tables for IKE translation consists of two partitions, one for the communication between the first computer and the intermediate computer and another for the communication between the intermediate computer and the second computer (See par. 24, lines 4-8; wherein the router (or intermediate computer) inherently includes at least two translation tables (or partitions), since one translation table is required for each IPsec connection, and there are at least two IPsec connections).

14. Regarding claim 26, Linnakangas teaches another translation table for IKE translation containing fields for matching a given user to a given second computer (See par. 24, lines 8-11; wherein each remote host must establish a new secure connection, which includes a new translation table).

15. Regarding claim 27, this claim recites a network for carrying out the method of claim 1, and is rejected for the same reasons.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2458

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 6, 11-14 & 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linnakangas, as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

17. Regarding claim 6, Linnakangas teaches the invention as described in claim 5. Linnakangas does not teach performing the automated key exchange protocol used for the preceding distribution of keys for forming the IP Sec connection by means of a modified IKE key exchange protocol between the first computer and the intermediate computer and by means of a standard IKE key exchange protocol between the intermediate computer and the second computer. However, AAPA teaches a modified IKE key exchange protocol between the first computer and the intermediate computer (See page 8, lines 27-29; wherein the key exchange is modified to support NAT traversal) and a standard IKE key exchange protocol between the intermediate computer and the second computer (See p. 8, lines 29-32).

Using the features of AAPA in the system of Linnakangas would have added flexibility by allowing different networks to connect to the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of AAPA and Linnakangas.

18. Regarding claim 11, Linnakangas teaches the invention as described in claim 1. Linnakangas does not teach the first computer being a mobile terminal, so that the



Art Unit: 2458

mobility is enabled by modifying the translation table at the intermediate computer. However, AAPA teaches this limitation (See p. 7, lines 10-16).

Using the features of AAPA in the system of Linnakangas would have broadened the appeal and applicability of the system by allowing mobile units to connect to the network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of AAPA and Linnakangas.

19. Regarding claim 12, Linnakangas, in view of AAPA, teach the invention as described in claim 11. Linnakangas further teaches performing the modification of the translation tables by sending a request for registration of the new address from the first computer to the intermediate computer (See p. 3, par.'s 46-51).

20. Regarding claim 13, Linnakangas, in view of AAPA, teach the invention as described in claim 12. Linnakangas further teaches sending a reply to the request for registration from the intermediate computer to the first computer (See p. 3, par. 50).

21. Regarding claim 14, Linnakangas, in view of AAPA, teach the invention as described in claim 12. Linnakangas further teaches authenticating or encrypting by IPSec the request for registration and/or reply (See p. 3, par. 62).

22. Regarding claim 20, Linnakangas teaches the invention as described in claim 1. Linnakangas does not teach sending the secure message by using an IPSec transport mode. However, AAPA teaches this limitation (See p. 4, lines 14-19).

Using the features of AAPA in the system of Linnakangas would have added improved security to the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2458

ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of AAPA and Linnakangas.

23. Regarding claim 21, Linnakangas teaches the invention as described in claim 1. Linnakangas does not teach sending the secure message by using an IPSec tunnel mode. However, AAPA teaches this limitation (See p. 4, lines 21-29).

Using the features of AAPA in the system of Linnakangas would have added improved security and flexibility to the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of AAPA and Linnakangas.

24. Claims 15-19 & 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linnakangas, as applied to claims 4 & 24 above, in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,985,953 issued to Sandhu, et al. (Sandhu).

25. Regarding claim 15, Linnakangas teaches the invention as described in claim 4. Linnakangas further teaches establishing the key distribution for the secure connections by establishing an IKE protocol translation table, and using the translation table to modify IP addresses of IKE packets in the intermediate computer (See par. 24, lines 4-6). Linnakangas does not teach using the translation table to modify cookie values of IKE packets in the intermediate computer. However, Sandhu teaches this limitation (See col. 7, line 55 to col. 8, line 19; wherein the KDC is the intermediate computer).

Using the features of Sandhu in the system of Linnakangas would have added another layer of security within the secure connection. Therefore, it would have been

Art Unit: 2458

obvious to one of ordinary skill, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Sandhu and Linnakangas.

26. Regarding claim 16, Linnakangas in view of Sandhu teach the invention as described in claim 15. Linnakangas does not teach establishing the key exchange distribution by: generating an initiator cookie and sending a zero responder cookie to the second computer, generating a responder cookie in the second computer, and establishing a mapping between IKE cookie values in the intermediate computer. However, Sandhu teaches generating an initiator cookie and sending a zero responder cookie to the second computer (See col. 8, lines 41-47; wherein the Authenticator is the initiator cookie), generating a responder cookie in the second computer (See col. 8, lines 41-47; wherein Bob's response is the responder cookie), and establishing a mapping between IKE cookie values in the intermediate computer (See col. 8, lines 49-51; wherein a mapping is required for authentication).

Using the features of Sandhu in the system of Linnakangas would have increased the number of security features available in the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Sandhu and Linnakangas.

27. Regarding claim 17, Linnakangas in view of Sandhu teach the invention as is described in claim 15. Linnakangas further teaches modifying a IKE protocol between the first computer and the intermediate computer by transmitting the IKE keys from the first computer to the intermediate computer in order to decrypt and modify IKE packets

Art Unit: 2458

(See par.'s 4 & 24; wherein the remote host 4 is an IPSec node that sends the IKE keys, and equates to applicant's first computer).

28. Regarding claim 18, Linnakangas in view of Sandhu teach the invention as is described in claim 15. Linnakangas further teaches carrying out the modification of the IKE packets by the first computer with the intermediate computer requesting such modifications (See par.'s 41-45; wherein the IKE module is in the intermediate computer).

29. Regarding claim 19, Linnakangas in view of Sandhu teach the invention as described in claim 17. Linnakangas further teaches defining the address so that the first computer is identified for the second computer by the intermediate computer by means of an IP address taken from a pool of user IP addresses when forming the translation table (See par.'s 56 & 57).

30. Regarding claim 25, Linnakangas teaches the invention as described in claim 24. Linnakangas further teaches both partitions of the mapping table for IKE translation contains translation fields for a source IP address and a destination IP address between respective computers (See par. 24, lines 4-8; wherein source and destination addresses are inherent in IPSec). Linnakangas does not teach the mapping table for IKE translation contains translation fields for initiator and responder cookies between respective computers. However, Sandhu teaches a mapping table that contains translation fields for initiator and responder cookies between respective computers (See col. 8, lines 41-51; wherein the authenticator is the initiator cookie and Bob's response is the responder cookie).

Using the features of Sandhu in the system of Linnakangas would have provided increased security and insured that messages were transmitted to the correct destination. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Sandhu and Linnakangas.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Seto whose telephone number is (571)270-7198. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday and alt. Fridays, 9:30 AM-7 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph E. Avellino can be reached on (571) 272-3905. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2458

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JKS

5/28/2009

/Joseph E. Avellino/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2458